

A.—Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—

(a) It was not handed over to the District Board.

(b) Rs. 997 during 1958-59.

Veterinary Compounders in the State.

*Q.—347. Sri M. LINGE GOWDA (Kanakapura).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the number of Veterinary Compounders in the State ;

(b) their scales of pay ;

(c) the minimum qualification required for their job ?

A.—Sri N. RACHIAH (Minister for Agriculture, Excise and Social Welfare).—

(a) 268.

(b) Junior Grade: Rs. 30—1—40.
Senior Grade: Rs. 40—2—60.

(c) (i) Educational Qualification :—
VIII Standard.

(ii) Should have passed the Veterinary Compounders' Training Course.

2 P.M.

ADDITIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1959-60.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Sir, with your permission, I move :

“That on the recommendation of the Governor of Mysore, a further sum not exceeding Rs. 33,800 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 33,800 be granted to

the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax.”

All the Demands are before the House and Hon'ble Members may make remarks on all the Demands. I need not remind the Hon'ble Members that the scope of the discussion is very much limited. The Hon'ble Members will make remarks only in respect of the items mentioned.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—I should not like to touch upon all the demands. Only with regard to two of the demands I wish to make a few remarks because we will have ample opportunities to make observations at the time of general discussion on the Budget. Under Demand No. 17—Police, I find the following explanatory Note :

“Some of the Police Officers who were dismissed from service had filed civil suits and the Court held the orders passed by the Superintendent of Police, Belgaum, as void and the plaintiffs deemed to be still in service and also passed decrees that the defendant i.e., Government should pay to the plaintiffs their arrears of pay, etc., as also the cost of the suits. No stay could be granted being money decrees and the total sum of Rs. 10,688-5-3 was required to be deposited in the Court before 18th February 1960.”

We find that innumerable civil suits and writ petitions are being filed against the actions of the Government. I do not know whether this Government are very badly served by their legal advisers or they did not care for the rules or they did not care for the laws they themselves are bound to obey. Even in this supplementary estimate, I find a few instances of their being called upon to pay the amounts after decrees were obtained. I feel that when the party is the

(SRI V. SRINIVASA SHETTY)

Government, it is their bounden duty to come to some agreement, if it is possible. It is not proper for the Government to stand on prestige. There are two constables here who were driven to a court and they obtained a decree for Rs. 10,638-5-3. I am really astonished that the Government are so bankrupt in legal advice; they may not have legal acumen; but this is not the only instance when these mistakes are committed by the Government at the instance of their advisors. I hope at least they will do better next time.

The second item is about the introduction of prohibition in Bidar District. The explanatory note says:

“On introduction of prohibition in Bidar District, additional staff was sanctioned by Government.”

It was thought of before; we had long discussion here and even after all this, the Government did not think that the staff was insufficient. After all, they introduced prohibition in Bidar and two taluks of Hassan District. Why was this not thought of then? It was said that it was a new service. I do not know whether it could be a new service at all. This supplementary estimate is a second instalment. It is really astonishing; once in a way if a new contingency arises, the Government can come before this House and we have to grant their requests. But they cannot come before us again and again with such requests. During the Budget Session, they had ample opportunities. But now they come forward with additional grants for these petty things. What I submit is that the Government is not being run efficiently. That is very clear. I do not wish to say anything with regard to this matter of policy of prohibition. We had just a sample of the working of prohibition in one of the Districts where prohibition was introduced very recently and the Hon'ble Minister during the question hour said that more the cases, the better the working of the prohibition is. Ultimately we may come to a period when the number of cases in

certain taluks may be lakhs and the Hon'ble Minister will pat himself on his back and say that there are one lakh cases and that the prohibition has worked very well. Some such farce is being carried on. You have no forethought or planning and you have to come before the Hon'ble House for additional grants.

One more thing I wish to say with regard to Education, i.e., Demand No. 20. We have been asking again and again that the Government should take over all the high schools or other schools which are under the management and control of District Boards. But the Government are not willing to do so. Even now, in my own District, the highest number of schools in the District are under the control of the District Board. The Government have not yet made up their mind whether these schools should be taken over or not. How many times have I reminded the Government and the Hon'ble Minister? What is your decision in the matter? You have not been able to tell us so far. But here is a case where all of a sudden two Middle-cum-High Schools—one at Hanumasagar, in Raichur District and another at Mudbi, Bidar District, have been taken over to the control of the Education Department and the extra expenditure involved on account of taking over of these schools is about Rs. 30,000. The declared policy of the Government seems to be not to take over any private or district board school, but here, the Government have all of a sudden taken over schools to the control of the Education Department. I request the Hon'ble Minister to enlighten us on this matter and tell us why these two schools were taken over by them. I request the Government at this stage to have a uniform policy on this question. I am not anxious that Government should take over schools. But if that is the policy of the Government, I am jealous of the old Mysore area.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Should there be no exception to the general rule?

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I am jealous of the old Mysore area where most of the schools are under the

control of the Government. I wish that we are able to apply this to all the areas. If it is possible to bring in uniformity all over the State, why should they shirk the responsibility? Because, it is the public, it is the students and it is the teachers who are affected. You know the scale of pay that is being given to the teachers. Their future pension and all other things are affected. Now the District Boards have completely gone and the District Development Councils come into the picture. The Government have not yet made up their mind in this matter. We are making a representation to the Education Minister to consider this. I know that the educational institutions in the whole of Hyderabad area are in a backward state. I wish the Government should take over more institutions. Let not anybody go with the impression that I am jealous or against the Government taking over these institutions. I wish all the institutions in Hyderabad and South Kanara areas were taken over by the Government.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—When you manage them well.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—When you are under taking Herculean tasks which can never be accomplished properly, why not take over these private institutions which the district boards have been managing? It is not an impossible task. I draw the attention especially of the Local Self-Government Minister and the Education Minister to this question. Let the Government make up their minds as early as possible to do something with regard to these institutions. Let them not give any room for bitterness and jealousy that they are treating a particular area in a different manner from the others. I say there are certain areas for example, in the unfortunate district of mine, wherein most of the educational institutions are under the control of the District Board and the District Board has vanished now. To say that these educational institutions have to be under the control of the Taluk Board and Panchayat Boards—it would be a gloomy picture, we know. It will be a fighting arena for local

factions. If even the elementary schools are to be entrusted to the care and tender mercies of these local bodies—we know what these local bodies are—one can imagine what a gloomy picture it would be! We are beginning to hope that Ramarajya will emerge. For Heaven's sake, do not entrust these institutions to the local bodies. If you do it, the educational picture will be a very gloomy one. I draw the attention of the Government and of the two Hon'ble Ministers who are happily present here so that they may take an early decision with regard to the management and the running of the educational institutions in the State. With this I am done, Sir.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjan-gud).—Sir, I have a preliminary objection to raise with regard to the presentation of the supplementary estimates amounting roughly to five crores of rupees. We cannot say anything about the one crore, because it is a charged item. I am referring to 3 crores 63 lakhs and odd. The amount provided in the Budget is sanctioned by this Legislature under the Contingent Fund. I want to know how Government can put a fat bill of three crores when the Legislature has sanctioned an expenditure of not more than two crores under the Contingent Fund. That is a point I wish to raise.

Coming to the Demands, it is a matter for the Hon'ble Finance Minister to say, last year, I raised the same question. You take power from the Legislature to provide Contingent Fund not exceeding two crores, and if in the course of the year, you incur even a pie in excess, where is the legal sanction? That is the point. I do not wish to make a long speech.

Coming to Demand No. 5, I want a clarification from the Hon'ble Finance Minister. The note says :

“on the basis of the revised estimates for the current year furnished by the Chief Conservator of Forests a total additional provision to the extent of Rs. 52.32 lakhs is required during the year

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

on several heads of expenditure as detailed above in order to realise increased revenue to the extent of nearly Rs. 54 crores..."

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—54 lakhs.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You give an explanatory note, and if the note makes it more confusing, I do not know what it means. That is why I said that I wanted a clarification. I do not understand what it means. "As the additional provision was required during the year for immediate expenditure under several heads, an advance of Rs. 32.32 lakhs was sanctioned out of the Contingency Fund which is now proposed to be recouped." My point is: what are the additional items which are now contemplated? What was the difficulty? While framing the Budget why could not be provided for? How can it be said that it is an additional allotment to the department? What is the point in regard to this matter? Supply of timber is not a new thing.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Supply of bamboo to Paper Mills.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—All right. What is there? If you had only got the average expenditure or the intake of bamboo for paper mills for five million tons, you could have made a provision then itself. As the Leader of the Opposition, said the framing of the Budget should be realistic. There must be a realistic approach by a responsible leader like Sri Mariappa.

Then coming to Demand No. 8, in respect of Receipts under Entertainment Tax, you say that on account of uniformity in introducing Entertainment Tax in all the areas of the Mysore State, you did not know what exactly would be the receipts under the tax. The provision of 27 lakhs now "provided in the Budget is found to be inadequate to meet the expenditure on account of payment of 90 per cent of the collections of Entertainment Tax to Local Bodies." Under Receipts item alone, I have made the general remark that in one case you give a conservative estimate of the receipts over income and

in the other case, you always make a liberal provision. What was the difficulty for you to assess at five per cent or even ten per cent accuracy? Even 27 lakhs was not sufficient. You are now asking for 24 lakhs.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You will kindly see that there is a new Act and therefore we have not been able to know the progress of collections.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The new Act came into force in January 1959, long before the Budget for 1959-60 was prepared.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Collections will go on throughout the year.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That means you are not sure of your officers' collecting.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Originally in some cases we took over the collection of this tax from Municipalities, and centralised collection through the Sales Tax Department. It is for the first time that the Sales Tax Department took over the collection and naturally it was a new agency. That is the reason why it has happened.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You read the note. "Based on the progress of collection and the payments so far made" You are not sure whether you would collect this money. You have now come to the Legislature with a request for an additional provision, because you feel that the progress of collection is satisfactory!

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is very good.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am only talking from the point of view of framing the Budget, that this kind of framing estimates is not realistic.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Because this is the first year we took over from the local bodies...

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—So you want this amount because this is the first year. All right.

Coming to Demand No. 10, this is under "Other Revenue expenditure financed from ordinary revenue" Sir, they say "on account of regularisation of expenditure incurred for the Ex-Water Supply Investigation Division which continued up to 2nd November 1959." It is not stated, for what

duration this Investigation Division was sanctioned and how long did it continue and how was it authorised to continue. That information is not available. That is one of the reasons advanced to ask for nine lakhs of rupees. What was the amount of expenditure incurred unauthorisedly with reference to the Dharwar Investigation Circle? You also say that the expenditure that is being incurred is incurred with a skeleton staff and that additional grant is found necessary. There seems to be apparent contradiction. Authorised expenditure is incurred—item No. 1. The establishment was continued beyond the period of sanction—item No. 2. It is now continued—item No. 3. And you want to make additional grants. It is a serious matter. It should be looked into.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is perhaps due to the reorganisation.....

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then, on page 7, the Demand is not numbered.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That is because it is a charged item and charged items are not numbered.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Coming to Demand No. 17, the explanatory note says:

“On introduction of prohibition in Bidar District, additional staff was sanctioned by Government. The extra expenditure on account of the additional staff sanctioned exceeds the sum of Rs. 30,000 per annum (recurring) and therefore an advance of Rs. 40,000 was sanctioned out of the Contingency Fund as the item of expenditure falls under the category of ‘New Service’.”

Is this an item which should be treated as a new service?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—There is a new criterion evolved. I will mention it later.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have got the Government Order dated 17th February 1959. The definition of new service is given in Appendix VI to the Budget Manual. It should be considered a new service if the item of

expenditure or scheme or service was not contemplated at the time of preparation of the budget and the necessity for it arises only during the course of the year. If you judge from these two standards, it will be seen that all the money you have asked for under Demand No. 17 is not justified. You knew at the time of the budget that you were going to introduce prohibition in that district and so how can this be treated as a new service?

Then, under item 3, you say that the budget provision of Rs. 27 lakhs and odd is inadequate and that you want a further sum of Rs. 3 lakhs. This Talkad Jatra comes once in five years and you knew in what year it would come. The other reason given, namely, the transfer of personnel from district to district, is incidental. Are these the matters which are new?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is very difficult to estimate accurately. We may have to transfer or we may have to draft more policemen.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Coming to item 5, it is stated that ‘Government ordered the purchase of vehicles to the extent of Rs. 13.50 lakhs and to meet the expenditure an advance was sanctioned out of the Contingency Fund treating the item as “new service”’. Here is another item which offends against the concept of new service. That you should buy jeeps in a particular year on account of the demand from a department was not a matter which could not have been unforeseen.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Granting that we had negatived the request of the Department in the first instance, and subsequently, suppose, they make out a good case and suppose further that we sanction, we will have to bring it to the notice of the House.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Because the Demand is made by the Police Department you have unconditionally agreed to it. If it had been from any other department, in spite of yourself you would not have looked into it.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Even in the case of this department, for the first time it was negatived and only subsequently it was sanctioned.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.— what I mean to say is that the administrative machinery is out going into the entire matter in full detail. The Police Department should not make exaggerated demands and both at the level of the department and at the level of the Secretariat, there must be greater scrutiny particularly in the matter of making allotment of funds.

Coming to item 7, regarding the purchase of wireless sets, this is a matter which has surprised me. Why should this matter come up as a supplementary grant? When there is a plan for five years, the expenditure should also be planned. Why should wireless sets be purchased suddenly after the budget was sanctioned and there is no provision for it?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The purchase of wireless sets is not under the plan.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There is no planning in regard to items of expenditure. Why should there be a sudden spurt for wireless sets? What happened to the old wireless sets? Are they additional sets?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—To the best of my recollection, there was need for additional sets.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—This shows lack of imagination on the part of the officers concerned and lack of planning in regard to expenditure in various departments.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is not a question of lack of planning, but it is a question of delaying the incurring of expenditure.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do concede that there should be the minimum number of wireless sets. That the entire district should be served by wireless sets is a matter known to everybody. If they know beforehand that there are no wireless sets, it is up to them to send their demand well in time before the preparation of the budget. I consider that it is a question of privilege for both the Government and the Legislature. Are you justified in increasing your expenditure beyond the limit of Rs. 2 crores prescribed by the sanction of the Legislature?

2-30 P.M.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If I am not revealing any secret, I may tell the Hon'ble Member that twice in a year I call for a meeting of the Officers and impress upon them the need for giving correct estimates as far as possible. I have told them that I would be taken to task by the Legislature for asking any excess grants.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In spite of that, you promote such persons as Heads of Departments.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That is a different matter.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to co-operation, you say that the Government have accepted proposals of the Government of India for implementation of Supplementary Plan Co-operative Development during the year. You have not told us what plan is. The item (ii) is managerial cost for reorganisation of small-sized societies at Rs. 10,000 each. The Legislature is not aware of the plan which the Government of India have put forward and you accepted. We are not aware of the purpose for which Rs. 10,000 is given to each society.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—To the service societies.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What for are you giving the amount? Is it for establishment? Please give details.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The entire amount is towards share capital.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But, here it is stated as managerial cost. The Budget head is wrong. If it is share capital, it would not come under this head.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I will verify it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In respect of Demand No. 27, it is a very big item of expenditure. One particular sentence under this Demand is very significant. You have stated that "Full effect of wages award.....were also contributory causes". Was it not possible to foresee all these items of expenditure at the time of preparation of the original Budget? My point is, what proportion of this total cost

relates to wage award? You say that Rs. 16 lakhs is due to payment of bonus to employees.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The whole thing was pending before the Supreme Court.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I know that. I want to know what proportion of the total cost you require in respect of wage award.

In regard to Demand No. 32, you require 11 lakhs in addition to the sum of Rs. 10 lakhs already sanctioned for the Belgaum Division. In this connection I want to know whether there is not a Famine Relief Fund in the State.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Yes, we have.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then, if this amount is not paid out of that Fund, for what purpose are you having that fund?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In any case it has to come before the Legislature.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You can incur the actual expenditure. I want to know the amount at credit under the Famine Relief Fund. Is it not adequate to meet the payments?

In respect of Demand No. 35, you want to open two new heads of account. What is the first item? Why do you say that these have to be opened newly? Was there not the Contributory Provident Fund scheme at all?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In some case it had to be opened newly.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Are they Government concerns or aided concerns? The whole note is not clear. You also say in the same note:

“Additional requirements under these heads are based on the actuals for 1958-59”.

Is it that the Government found it now that the amount has to be paid or is it the demand from the commercial concerns?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Actually we had to contribute that amount towards the Provident Fund. Perhaps after the agreement with the Labour, we have settled it.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, the member is putting

questions and the Minister is answering. The Minister can as well reply every point at the time of giving a reply. This is not the question hour.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As Sri C. M. Arumugham says, there will be a lot of confusion.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I will now refer to Demand No. 49.

Sir, here is a statement made by the Government in a very responsible manner:

“The Mysore Chrome Tanning Company Ltd., is one of the oldest industrial concerns in the State in which Government have taken a keen interest.”

Have not Government taken an equally keen interest in other industries also, I ask.

“In order to rehabilitate the industry and provide sufficient financial assistance to place it on a sound footing, Government have decided to subscribe to the preference Share capital issued by the concern.”

Have Government examined the results of the Chrome Tanning Company? I was associated with it some time back in 1948 or 1951. Similarly in regard to Mysore Cements, you have invested 15 lakhs. You want to give Rs. 7.50 lakhs during the current year. Subsequently, you again refer to co-operative development during the year. You have made the statement:

“Government have accepted the proposals of the Government of India for implementation of Supplementary Plan for Co-operative

rupees two lakhs and eight lakhs respectively are included under this Demand to implement the scheme during the year.”

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

You also say :

“the amounts were advanced from out of the Contingency Fund earlier and are now proposed to be recouped.”

I am asking why Government should not make a lumpsum allotment in the Budget for participation in the capital invested in co-operative societies and commercial concerns or aided concerns instead of coming before the House with a supplementary demand ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That will be borne in mind.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Coming to Demand No. 51, it is said :

“Government have sanctioned the purchase of 241 tenements under the Industrial Labour Housing and Low Income Group Housing Schemes at Gulberga and Raichur, for providing quarters for the police staff under the Centrally Sponsored Police Housing Scheme at a total cost of Rs. 7.42 lakhs.”

Sir, it is clear that these tenements were built under the Industrial Housing Scheme. Now you want to appropriate—I do not want to use the word ‘Misappropriate’—the same for housing the police. What is this ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—They were not occupied by the Industrial labour.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is a different matter. If you wanted police quarters urgently at Gulberga or Raichur, you should not have utilised tenements built for industrial labour. You now say that they were not occupied by them. You could compel the industrial labour to occupy these tenements, if you could do it at Mandya and Channapatna.....

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—There, they were all occupied when they were built. In Gulberga they were built long back before the dismemberment of Hyderabad.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works and Electricity).—A number of buildings were constructed before integration and the formation of the New State, and now these buildings are vacant. Is it wisdom to allow them to be vacant or is it wise to purchase them and utilise them, I would like to ask Sri J. B. Mallaradhyia.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is wise to buy them under the conditions explained by you. I do not dispute it at all. The point is this ; if the present Government are not responsible for the construction of these buildings, I have no objection.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is the previous Hyderabad Government that had constructed these buildings.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then I will not put forward that at all.

Then it is said :

“Sanction was accorded for the construction of Buildings for Government High Schools at Shorapur, Yadgir and Shahapur in Gulberga District at an estimated cost of Rs. 1.36 lakhs. Budget provision was not included for these works.”

How did the Government work out a project costing to the tune of 1.36 lakhs without even a budget provision ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That is why we have included it as a new service.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The works have not been completed. They are just started.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI (Minister for Education).—There was no budgetary provision for them. Therefore this sanction was necessary.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—At the time of the Budget these works were not included. Subsequently, in view of the urgency, sanction has been accorded and we have asked for a token grant.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, the Department of Education is a Department which spends 9 to 10 crores. You are making a provision of 13 crores in the present Budget.

But I can very well understand that this increase is to meet enhanced salaries rather than it is an indication of the expansion of education. Any way, in a Department which spends nearly 12 crores, it should not be difficult for you to find 1.36 lakhs for re-appropriation. Why do you want to treat it as a new item? Construction of buildings should not be treated as a new service. I want the Government to strictly conform to some principles. You have not applied the definition of "New Service" at all.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In fact, we need not have brought this before the Legislature. But because it is a new item, it is always good that we bring it before the House. Every item is treated as a new service. Even the Accountant General insists that it should be brought before the Legislature. He says it is better that it is brought before the Legislature.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, there is only one last item.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—You have very carefully picked up these things.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Demand No. 58 page 33 it reads:

"The State Government have agreed to implement the Middle Income Group Housing Scheme and the Life Insurance Corporation of India has given a sum of Rs. 25.00 lakhs to the State Government on account of this scheme."

I want to know, when you take a loan from the Life Insurance Corporation and transfer it to the Housing Board, what is the difference in regard to the rate of interest? Are you going to give it at the same rate at which you get it from the Life Insurance Corporation or what are the terms and conditions under which you transfer this amount to the Housing Board? Why is it that the Life Insurance Corporation does not deal directly with the Housing Board? Is it because of security reasons? I want to know whether you are going to give any guarantee or whether you take the loan and transfer it?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We take the loan and transfer it to the Housing Board.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want to know whether there is any variation in the rates of interest.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I will get it for you.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Next point is, Loans to Electricity Board, item No. 5. When the receipts and expenditure of the Electricity Board were discussed, I said that there was a provision in the Electricity Board Act to allow the Electricity Board itself to go to the open market for raising a loan. There is no objection to the Government of Mysore giving any loan if it becomes necessary. They would need crores of rupees. I want to know on what terms the Government of Mysore have advanced this loan to the Electricity Board, and whether the Electricity Board could not have taken the benefit of obtaining a more remunerative rate of interest from the open market, and why is it that you want to deplete the resources of the State by one crore of rupees?

I have nothing more to say, Sir.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA (Chikodi).—Sir, while supporting the Supplementary Demands made by the Government, I want to make a few observations.

To start with, while going through these Demands and explanatory notes, one feels sometimes that the explanatory notes provided are rather very brief and cryptic. They are not sufficiently explanatory. For instance as was pointed out by some Hon'ble friends who spoke before me, one can just refer to Demand No. 26 on page 16—amount required for co operative development during the year. I think it would have been much better if there had been a proper explanation. I was just watching what was going on between the Hon'ble Minister for Finance and Sri Mallaradhy. That is not exactly the way things should go on. The explanatory notes are not sufficiently explanatory at all.

The explanatory note should be sufficiently explanatory. Sometimes, in spite of the explanatory notes, it would be necessary to give some other

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALA)

explanations. These notes are very very cryptic. For instance, I am drawing the attention of the Hon'ble Finance Minister to Demand No. 33. Here the amount under this head is required to cover the expenditure on account of payments to other Governments under the S. R. Act. It would have been beneficial to the members if details had been given as to what amounts exactly would be paid to other Governments and all that. The explanatory note is very silent. Similar is the case with item No. 37 and 55. I am not finding fault with the supplementary demands made in this behalf. But the point is that some explanation ought to have been given so that it may not be necessary for the Hon'ble Finance Minister or any other Minister to give explanations when the Hon'ble Members are on their feet to make certain comments.

After the brief remarks in this manner, I want just to make out one or two points by way of reply to the comments made by the Hon'ble Members, Sri Srinivasa Shetty and Sri Mallaradhya. It was pointed out by Sri Mallaradhya that when the Contingency Fund was for two crores, how was it possible that amounts in excess of two crores had been provided out of the fund for the purpose of meeting the demands, regarding which sanction was sought. I am speaking subject to correction. It appears that many of the demands are not provided for from the Contingency Fund. Some of the amounts advanced for the purpose of meeting the supplementary requirements are either provided from savings made in the amounts already allotted in the Budget or by re-appropriation under some other heads. I do not know whether the Hon'ble Member has taken this into account.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—It cannot be re-appropriated. It has to be recouped.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have read it in the notes that in respect of a certain demand, there is a clear note, and only for balance they have come

up for the sanction of the Legislature. They have met any number of cases from reappropriation of sanctioned budget heads.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—As far as I understand, it is always necessary to finance amounts from the Contingency Fund, a new service or a service inadequately provided for, in the Budget. When the Department itself can provide for it from the amounts sanctioned and by re-appropriation, the natural thing is to bring this matter before the Legislature, as they have done. To illustrate, a reference may be made to Demand on page 5. The last paragraph says "This appropriation does not involve any additional commitments, but it is only a pro-forma adjustment. The amount booked under this head is transferred to "22 Interest on Debt and other Obligations" and all that.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It is a charged amount. Why are you converting the charged amount into a votable item?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Charged and Voted; the Finance Minister may reply as to whether I am correct or not. My view is that if the amount can be sanctioned by the Department, that can be used for another new service. But the only requirement on that amount is that it should be brought to the notice of the august House. It is not necessary to credit it to the Contingency Fund, after getting the reaction of the Legislature. That is the position as I understand.

Now I do not know—if this view is correct, all the contingency fund of two crores is exceeded. If it is exceeded, I think it will be rather irregular. In this matter I hope it will be explained by the Hon'ble Finance Minister.

Sri Srinivasa Shetty, commenting on court orders and review, said that the Government had become inefficient, that the Law Department was not properly functioning and that it was inefficient and all that. I do not accept that view. It is always possible to view things in different ways. The Government may take one view, the Law Department may take another

view and the High Court may take another view. But the views of the High Court are binding. When the law courts take a view, it is the duty of the Government to submit.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—They were all old cases.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Old or, new, such cases are not uncommon. Even in the case of the Government of India, such things are not uncommon.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In a certain case, re-instatement was ordered by the Supreme Court.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Simply because certain orders are passed by the High Court or the Supreme Court contrary to Government decisions it does not mean that the Law Department is not doing good service or it is inefficient. I think such a conclusion is unfounded. Secondly it was suggested by the Hon'ble Member Srinivasa Shetty that some supplementary demand was made on behalf of the Education Department for the purpose of taking over schools from the Gulbarga District, schools managed by the Local Board. That is what he said. He said that it should be the general policy of the Government to take over institutions run by the Local Boards or some other Board. There appears to be a difference of opinion on this subject. The responsibility of the State Government should be confined to only running primary schools and it should not extend to the secondary schools at all. If unfortunately certain schools which are under the control of the Local Boards are not properly run, or those authorities are abolished—for instance Local Boards are going to be abolished—it becomes the duty of the Government to take over such schools. Where schools are being managed by private management, Government should not burden its hands by taking over the management of such schools. That is the view accepted everywhere. It is the policy. I understand that this is the policy of the Central Government and also of other State Governments. Therefore the view expressed by the Hon'ble Member that all the schools run by the Local

Bodies should be taken over by the Government is not sound or correct. I support the demands put before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Dr. Nagan Gowda will speak after tea. We will rise for tea.

The House adjourned for recess at Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[**MR. SPEAKER** in the Chair]

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Hospet).—

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Supplementary Demands made by the Government. While doing so, I wish to offer a few remarks on some of the demands.

I am glad to note that under Demand No. 5, the Government expects to get an additional income of Rs. 42 lakhs by the expenditure of about Rs. 22 lakhs. If the Hon'ble Minister will give some information as to how this expenditure is to be incurred it will be useful. On the question of revenue from timber I wish to make a suggestion. Timber is now sold from Government depots which are located mostly near the forests. They should be located in District Headquarters places from where the district forest officers can make it available most easily to the people who require it. It is difficult for Maidan people to go over long distances and get timber.

Coming to Demand No. 8, under item 2, there is an additional revenue of Rs. 11 lakhs under the sugar cane cess. I must congratulate the Government for this. This is all to the credit of not only the Government but also of the growers of sugar cane in this State who have been able to increase the quantity of sugar cane. This is a cess that is collected from the various suppliers of sugar cane to the various factories in the State. It would have been of interest if information had been given as to from which

(DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA)

factories this Rs. 45.60 lakhs come and what are the amounts that we get from each factory. Here, I would like to mention that the Sugar Cane Cess Fund is to be administered by committees that are to be set up in the different areas. So far as I know in Hospet the Committee is yet to be set up. Though the Bill has been passed, the committees have not been set up. I hope it will be done soon.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Very soon they will be set up.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—I must thank the Hon'ble Finance Minister for that.

Under Demand No. 22, I am glad to note that they are going to organise 71 primary health centres and that one of those is going to be in my constituency. Due to some unfortunate reason the starting of it has been held up for a long time. All the necessary preliminaries have been gone through and I hope the Hon'ble Minister for Health will see his way to start this centre as soon as possible.

Under Demand No. 24, there is a new item of Rs. 15 lakhs sanctioned by the Government of India to the State Government for the award of Government of India scholarships. I am glad that the distribution of these scholarships has been entrusted to the State Government. This is a great improvement over the previous arrangement. It would have been better if they had increased the amount also. The selection of scholars from a distance of 2,000 miles is something that was all right during the British days but now it is something unthinkable and I am glad that though late in the day they have thought of doing it now. In this connection I would like to mention that a few of these scholarships have been distributed during the months of February and March. I need not mention that we are at the fag end of the year and it will rather cause hardship to the boys, especially poor boys, that require monetary help, to be made to wait for 10 months to get it.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—There were procedural difficulties and very recently the Director of Social Welfare went to Delhi, got the whole thing done, held a meeting and distributed them.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—That is very nice. This is the first year and I hope that next year you will be able to distribute them before September or October.

Coming to Demand No. 29 regarding the bridge at Gangavati, you propose to take money from the Sugar Cane Cess Fund for the construction of this bridge. How the Government can incur this expenditure from the Sugar Cane Cess Fund I am unable to understand.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is in the sugar cane area.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—This bridge will not be of use to the sugar cane growers either on this side of the river or on the other side of the river. It might be used to some extent for the present to transport sugar cane from one area to another but mainly all the sugar cane will go to the factories in the two different areas. Perhaps temporarily sugar cane from Gangavati may be transported to Kampli.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In fact, a representation was made that if this bridge was constructed it would facilitate the easy transport of sugar cane.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—Because of the huge area of sugar cane at Gangavati you cannot expect the growers to send them to Kampli and similarly because of the huge area of sugar cane at Kampli you cannot expect the growers there to send them to Gangavati. So, my suggestion to Government is that this amount of Rs. 11 lakhs and odd should be made available from the ordinary revenues of the Government.

I now come to Demand No. 51. I am glad to note that they are going to acquire a huge area known as the 'Beaulieu' consisting of about 20 acres and I must congratulate the Government for that, because space is required for Government offices and institutions. I may mention here that

there is a very keen demand for building space for the Law College. The Law College is now located in one of the smallest Government buildings. What was once the University Union Building is now used for housing the Law College. The space is very inadequate for the students. It is something which should not be allowed to go on for a very long time. I was told that this "Beaulieu" area was going to be utilised for the Law College building. I would like to know whether the Government intends to implement this suggestion.

Demand No. 58—In paragraph 2 of the explanatory note the Government have asked for a loan of Rs. 3 lakhs. As long ago as 1952 the Madras Government had provided Rs. 6 lakhs for assistance to the cultivators to develop the Tungabhadra Ayacut area. So, now to ask for only Rs. 3 lakhs is a pittance and I think the Government should ask for more money. In the explanatory note there is a statement made throwing the blame for non-development of 50 per cent of the area on the cultivators. This is a thing which has been done by the Public Works Department again and again. I have on more than one occasion stated that the development of the Tungabhadra Ayacut area as rapidly as was expected by those who built the dam and the canals, does not entirely depend on the cultivators. It depends to a considerable extent on the P.W.D. For an area of 93,000 acres, the Government have not provided distributary canals for some parts. On 1st January 1959, the Government stated that they had provided for 70,000 acres. Since then a year has passed and I want to know for how much area you have provided. The note states that only 45,000 acres have been developed and the remaining 47,000 acres are still to be developed. It does not entirely depend upon levelling and reconditioning. It also depends upon the supply of distributary canals. I wish to make it clear here that it is a wrong impression that is held in Delhi and here that the cultivators are not taking advantage of supply of water. It is not correct. The cultivators are anxious and are doing their utmost to develop the area. There are people who

are taking water illegally. That being the case, it is not the cultivators that are responsible. I hope the Government will not make such kind of statements.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—What are your suggestions?

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—You supply the distributary channels first. If there are no distributary channels from the main canal, how can you expect the cultivator to take advantage of the supply of water? The original provision regarding the Tungabhadra Project under the Madras Act was that water distributary channels and field channels should be brought to the last survey number. That was the provision.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Who is to pay for that?

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—The Government have to pay for it. That is the provision in the original programme. I am sure of it and I do not think the Hon'ble Minister can contradict me. These field channels should be constructed to the last survey number and should be done by the Government. It has been done in respect of 70,000 acres and they should do it for the rest of the acres.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Is it possible? Will the project be remunerative?

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—You are only hundred years late. This project has been thought of long ago. In 1937 it was sanctioned by the Madras Government and these were the provisions made. Now, to ask whether we can make any project profitable or remunerative is unwarranted and is not necessary. It is too late in the day to ask that question. It was taken purely to stave off famine that was frequenting that area every two or three years. I mentioned this because here a sentence reads that out of 92,308 acres only 45,000 acres have been developed and that the balance of 47,000 acres have not been developed and they have to be developed by levelling and reconditioning. It gives an idea that the people to be blamed are the cultivators. I wish to state that it is not the cultivators that are entirely to be blamed for this. Thank you.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—In view of the fact that we are to discuss the Budget Estimates and the Demands for Grants, I think we can restrict the speeches so that we can go home and study the Budget and come prepared tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are perfectly correct. We are close to each other. Sri G. Venkatai Gowda will be the last speaker.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—The Government by way of supplementary estimates have asked for Rs. 3,63,06,200 as a second instalment. The House is aware that during December 1959, this House had approved supplementary grant of about Rs. 1,32,33,237. I really do not understand how the Government have chosen to come before this House time and again and ask for additional sums. My submission to the House is that we have no objection to granting these additional sums provided the original amount earmarked for a particular work is found insufficient. No doubt there is a provision for asking supplementary grants under Article 205 of the Constitution. But under the guise of 'New Service, anything and everything cannot be brought and if it is done so, the clear financial picture of the State cannot be visualised. Therefore my submission is that if certain amounts that have been asked for, had been included in the financial estimates for the year 1959-60, naturally the closing balance of that year could have got affected. In such a case the opening balance for the year 1960-61 gets affected. So, such kind of asking for grant is called for only where it is necessary. The only ground on which such supplementary demands can be justified is when a particular item could not have been contemplated at the time of framing the financial statement. Secondly, it should have been absolutely necessary and not to have incurred that item of expenditure would have been detrimental to the interests of the State. My submission is that, if even routine items of expenditure should be included in New Service it would defeat the very purpose of supplementary demands and I do maintain that it is

very much uncalled for and it is ill-conceived for the simple reason that we will not be in a position to appreciate the clear picture of the financial position. Our Hon'ble Finance Minister yesterday presented the Budget Estimates to the House by saying that there is a minimum deficit. Supposing some of these items now included under supplementary Demands were included in the regular budget, to that extent naturally, it would have been a deficit budget. Possibly it would have given us a correct state of affairs and I should only say that these methods will only lead one to a wrong position and it becomes very difficult for us to believe when the Finance Minister says that the financial position of the State is very sound till the end of the Second Five Year Plan.

4 P.M.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—According to the figures given, you must admit that the financial position is sound until the end of the Second Five-Year Plan.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—We are not in a position to appreciate the correct position. That is my objection. Under the head 'New Service' anything and everything should not be brought. Government must really have had previous knowledge of many of the items in these Supplementary Demands. For instance the revised pay of the Agricultural Income-tax Inspectors should have been easily anticipated. There is another point. Why should there be another Agricultural income-tax Inspector separately for this purpose?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—There was a separate Income-tax Officer when that area was integrated with old Mysore. We have to take him over and give him the pay and allowances.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—In other places the Assistant Commissioners of the Revenue Department also attend to this work. Why should there be a separate Inspector in Coorg, I ask.

That is not the only item. Like that there are several items which should have been foreseen while framing the financial statements for 1959-60 and

some of them could have been included in the Budget Estimates presented to the House yesterday.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If it is included in the Budget Estimates for 1960-61, how can we make payments?

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—But if it was possible to defer payment till the next financial year, these items at least should have been postponed.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I thank you for your suggestion. But my colleagues will not allow me to defer like that. If I try to do it, I will get into trouble.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—My friend Sri Kothawale was suggesting the constitution of a Contingency Fund. As Sri Mallaradhyia said, it is a point, from which source the Government drew money to incur the expenditure, because we are aware that only two crores were available?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYIA.—I ask the Government to give a complete statement of the amount charged to the Contingency Fund, the amount they have spent so far during the year and the amount that they now want to get out of this fresh sanction from the Legislature. Unless that statement is furnished, we do not know whether the Government have kept up to the limit of two crores or whether they have exceeded it.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—They have taken the first instalment of Supplementary grant to the tune of one crore and odd and now again they want nearly three crores and odd. In all it comes to five crores. I request the Hon'ble Finance Minister to apprise us of the correct position as to from which source they draw this amount, which goes beyond two crores.

In Demand No. 13, item 4 Department of Efficiency Audit and Anti-Corruption was reorganised during the current year. Even during the discussion on the last year's budget, I happened to speak about the bad effect that would follow by this sort of re-organisation. Now they have entrusted the efficiency audit work to the Divisional Commissioners in the respective Divisions. They have

bifurcated the Directorate at Bangalore. My submission is that it may not work well, because the Divisional Commissioners are the Heads of Divisions, and any charge sheet against any officer in his Division will be placed before him. It is quite likely that he will have his own sympathies with the accused. I do not say that all the officers will be partial like that. What I say is that it is likely that people may be sympathetic towards their officers. If you entrust this work to the Divisional Commissioners, I do not think, we can expect an impartial decision. Justice certainly has to be done. Supposing a sheristedar is booked and the case is taken up; the Divisional Commissioner being the Head of the Division it is likely that he will have his own sympathy for the official.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You will have ample opportunities to talk on this subject.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—What I say is that there is no need for bifurcation of the Efficiency Audit and the Anti-Corruption Department.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You will have ample opportunities to talk on that subject during the Budget discussion. You are speaking about the policy, the policy of the Government in entrusting certain powers to the Deputy Commissioners. You will have ample opportunities for it.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—So far as the decrees obtained in courts are concerned, Sri Srinivas Shetty has already made a reference. As far as possible, it is better to take the advice of the Advocate-General in complicated cases. It is true that some of the Heads of Departments have power to dismiss. But ultimately the Government has to scrutinise whether the action taken is consistent with the rules of procedure or not.

So far as the conversion of 17 Middle cum-High Schools into the full-fledged High Schools in Hyderabad-Karnatak Area is concerned, Sri Srinivasa Shetty stated that the Government should take all the Schools under their management. It is a thing to be considered seriously. What is to

(SRI G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

happen after the formation of taluk boards? I may be permitted to make a suggestion for consideration. The local boards or some other agency which runs the schools are contributing, and the Government is also contributing. Let the Government take over all the schools. At the same time, let them recover from local bodies or other agencies, the amount of money they were spending on these schools. The difficulty for the Government to take over these institutions is financial implications, because additional expenditure has to be incurred. Therefore, that amount could be recovered from local bodies and these institutions could be taken over. Even entrusting these institutions to District Development Councils may not be correct. There is ample provision for the Government even to deduct from the revenues earmarked for the respective taluk boards.

Regarding Demand No. 33, the Explanatory Note says that "the requirement is to cover the expenditure on account of payments to other Governments under the S. R. Act, 1956." Could it not have been possible to include this in the next year's financial statement?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We have to transfer it to several Governments, immediately after the Accountant-General gives the figures. We have to pay something to Hyderabad and Hyderabad has to pay something to us. We have to pay something to Bombay and they have to pay us something. It is a question of adjustment. We come to know only about this when the Accountant-General sends all figures to us. It is obvious that we will not transfer for the fun of it.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I do not attribute motives. It could have been brought over to the next financial statement.

Even in respect of Demand No. 44 what is the corresponding need that is created is not mentioned. As Sri Kothavale pointed out...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳಲು ನಮಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳಿವೆ; ಆಗ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—My only submission is that if there had been a clear scrutiny and certain items had been taken into account, then we would have been in a better position to visualise the financial position of the State.

†Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum--I).—Sir, in the first place, I should like to know the procedure that is being followed so far as these Supplementary Demands are concerned. First of all, Sir, these Demands are governed by article 205 of the constitution; And then, they are governed by Rule 171 of our Rules of Procedure, It says that the procedure in the case of Budget has got to be followed. So far as these demands are concerned. I do not think that we are following the procedure either prescribed in the Constitution or prescribed under the Rules of Procedure of this House. I should like to know whether you have under your authority suspended the operation of these rules so far as the present demands are concerned. Otherwise, there must be a general discussion. You may put a time-limit. And then, demands must be placed one by one before this House and discussion must ensue. What I am seeing is, here we on this side, and the Ministers on that side are exchanging views so far as explanatory notes are concerned. We are not considering the demands one by one. Whether all the procedure followed here from 2 O' clock up till now, is regular and in order—on that point I should like to have a ruling from you before I offer my remarks on these demands.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You can speak. I will give the ruling afterwards.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I think the Hon'ble Member was not here when I moved the demand and when all the demands were placed before the House by you.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—A copy of the printed demands was supplied to us yesterday. To move each demand, a particular Minister has been mentioned as the mover. This printed matter is before us. It has been circulated to all the members. It is, therefore, incumbent upon each and

every Hon'ble Minister to place that particular demand before the House by him alone and not through the Hon'ble Speaker. I submit that the printed lists of demands is given to us by the Secretary and the procedure shown there, ought to have been followed. I do not think that the powers given to the various Ministers can be taken away by the Hon'ble Speaker for putting up all the demands at one and the same time.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is too late.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I raised that point earlier and the Hon'ble Speaker said that all the demands were before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are in the third year and we have been following this procedure from the beginning. Of course, there are two ways of putting the demands. One is—individual Ministers make a motion and it is proposed by the Speaker to the House. In the other case the Speaker himself proposes the motion. I have combined both of them. I have been doing it from the beginning. It is not incorrect at all.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—So far as the present demands are concerned, the printed matter was never given to us. This is given to us now—this year. It clearly mentions the names of every Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That only means that the Minister, if he is called upon to make a motion, will make it.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I shall read the first line. "Minister for Finance.—Sir, on the recommendation of the Governor of Mysore, I beg to move:—" This shows that the Minister to whom the demand pertains should move and it is not given to the Hon'ble Speaker to move all of them. The next demand is in the name of the Minister for Forest and Transport and he should have moved it as per the printed list circulated to members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If I call upon them to make a motion they must do so. Otherwise, I can propose all the demands to the House myself. That has been the practice obtaining here.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Tomorrow the Executive may say that the Legislature is usurping their powers.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Technically you are correct, but the procedure we have adopted here is something different. Therefore, the procedure I have adopted is also correct.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I wish to refer to only one demand, namely, Demand No. 17. In the explanatory note on page 10 they have referred to the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samithi. It is only because of that I have to say a few words. Otherwise, I would not have taken part in the short discussion of these supplementary demands.

Here I must point out to Hon'ble Members that the N.E.S. is not a body meant only for agitational purposes. It is a body meant for vindicating the grievances of the people, the natural feelings of the people before the Government of Bombay and before the Centre. For that purpose they had set up in the last elections five candidates in the Belgaum area and two in the Bidar area and all of them have been elected by a vast majority as against the Congress candidates. That shows that this body is doing constitutional activity and is vindicating the grievances or fulfilling the wishes of the people of that area. They have succeeded in the last elections and they are carrying on a peaceful agitation. That is not bad and I hope the Hon'ble Chief Minister will certainly appreciate our stand that so long as we are peaceful and so long as our movements are peaceful we are entitled to form these associations under the Constitution itself. So, in the name of this agitation, what has the police done? They want to crush us by lathis. They do not want any prosecution, nor do they want to take recourse to courts of law. In the last agitation, according to the admission of the Hon'ble Chief Minister, more than 11,000 people had taken part in satyagraha. But what did the Government do? They only prosecuted about 1,800 people and the rest were not prosecuted at all. Why? Is this Government not bound to prosecute every one who has committed a

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

breach of the law? Why have they not done their duty? When the Government failed in their duty to prosecute all those who had committed a breach of the law, the people had to take the next step of no-tax campaign. It is also a peaceful campaign and it is merely an extension of the satyagraha movement. At the time of the satyagraha movement all these people had to go to particular centres to perform satyagraha but when the Government did not arrest them and refused to prosecute them, they did call the Government to their homes to arrest them. For this purpose this no-tax campaign was started and the participants were never violent. I do not want to refer to it but only want to submit that we are following the rule of law by peaceful means while the police are following the rule of lathi and not the rule of law.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If all the Hon'ble Members of the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samithi behave like my friend Sri V. S. Patil, it is not necessary for me to keep even one single police constable there.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I must thank the Hon'ble Chief Minister for giving me the compliment which I think I do not deserve because I am one of them.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I have been observing ever since I came to Mysore that he is behaving very peacefully and trying to bring about amity and good relations between the two communities. Others are not doing it.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—So, I should like to oppose this particular demand and especially the increase in expenditure due to this movement. Sometime back the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya asked why these wireless sets were purchased suddenly. I feel they have purchased them because of this movement. The Government had to purchase these sets because they had to instal them in every nook and corner to see what these M.E.S. people were doing and to watch their movements. In spite of all that, our Government, especially the Police Department, is the most inefficient department. I have got the experience of the Bombay

Police Department. They used to watch our movement very closely and they used to watch what cigarettes we smoked and note such minor details. I do not think the Chief Minister has got full and correct details about all the agitators in spite of his Police Department. That is really a defect in the Police Department which ought not to be there at all.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—If you want us to do all that we will have to spend lakhs and lakhs which we do not want to.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—To maintain law and order and peace in the State even if we have to spend crores of rupees we will not object to that. But I say that your police are most inefficient and their only method is the third degree method. In the Embassy Hotel the purse of one of our friends was stolen. Within five minutes he lost about Rs. 500. What was the result? The police were incompetent to trace the offenders. This is the efficiency of our police. That is why I say it is no use spending any further amount on the police establishment.

4-30 P.M.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI (Minister for Education).—No exception has been taken for taking over two schools in Hyderabad area. But one thing that has been argued is that on the analogy of those schools, the District Board Schools also should be taken over by the Government. In this connection, I would like to refer to the system prevailing in Hyderabad. These two schools were not run by any local bodies. Secondly, there was a registered private society which was running these schools. In Hyderabad, after 1948, what was done was, a private committee was formed and it was allowed to function as High School Committee and the High School was attached to the existing Government Middle school on the express understanding that as and when the State Government decided to take it over, it would be taken over by the Government itself. Therefore the Headmasters of these two middle schools were the headmasters of the High Schools also

and one or two teachers were added by the private body and some equipment and building and contribution were taken by these private bodies. These high school classes were attached to the very Government middle schools. The private bodies were anxious to hand over the schools to the Government and therefore these two high schools were taken over by the Government. There was no question of a private body functioning independently and running the schools. Because the high school classes were attached to Government middle schools and were run by a registered society, these two schools were taken over by the Government in order to remove that anomaly. With regard to taking over of high schools run by the District Board this question is being considered by the Local Self-Government Department and the Government have to take a decision. It is under the active consideration of the Government and they will take an early decision. We know the anxiety of the members. Since the liquidation of the District Boards, the question has cropped up and we are shortly taking a decision on that point. Sri Mallaradhy raised a point that the building grant could have been given through re-appropriation and not through a 'new service'. What is a new service and what is not a new service is a thing which will be explained by our Finance Minister. At any rate there was no provision and therefore in order to sanction the amount, we had to take it from the Contingency Fund. The Finance Department suggested that this could not be done through reappropriation and be done as a new service. So, the amount was drawn from the Contingency Fund.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ (ರೋಗೋಪವೇಶಿಣಿ ಮತ್ತು ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಕೆಲವು ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿಗೇಷನ್ ಸರ್ಕಲ್ಸ್; ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಒಂದು; ಆಗಿನ ಬಡ್ಡಿಯನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ 60 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಫ್ರೋವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು. ಧಾರ್ವಾಡ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದ ಮೇಲೆ 18 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ವರೆಗೆ ಹಣ ಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ವಾಟರ್ ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಡಿವಿಜನ್ ಯಾವಾಗ, ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಯಿತು, ಯಾವಾಗ ಕ್ಲೋಜ್ ಆಯಿತು ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನೂ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ

ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಇದು 3ನೆಯ ನವೆಂಬರ್ 1958ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿ 2ನೆಯ ನವೆಂಬರ್ 1959ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಲೋಜ್ ಆಯಿತು. ಡಿವಿಜನ್ ಕ್ಲೋಜ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಇನ್ನೂ ಇತ್ತು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ 2ನೆಯ ಮೇ 1959ರವರೆಗೂ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ 20 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಬೇಕಾದುವು. ಈಗ 9 ಲಕ್ಷ 41 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಬೇಕಾಗಿವೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ರೀ-ಅಪ್ರೋಪ್ರಿಯೇಷನ್ನಿನಿಂದ ಮೀಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು ರೆಗ್ಯುಲರಿಜೇಷನ್ ಆಫ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಆನ್ ಆಥರೈಜ್ಡ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್ ಇಕರ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಅದು ವಾಟರ್ ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಡಿವಿಜನ್ನಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು. ಮೊದಲು ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಫ್ರೋವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು. ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಆನ್ ಆಥರೈಜ್ಡ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್ ಆಯಿತು. ಅದನ್ನು ರೆಗ್ಯುಲರಿಜೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ವಿವರಗಳು ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆ. ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರೇ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಲೋನ್ ರೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತವೆನ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಣ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿ ತೊಂದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ, ಟರ್ಮ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಂಡಿಷನ್ಸ್ ಏನು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಲೋನ್ ರೈಸ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ರೈಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅವರು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅದು 4-5 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಲೋನ್ ರೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದು ಎಲ್ಲೋ ಅಲ್ಪಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣ; ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ಮೊದಲ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಲೋನ್ ರೈಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು 48 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಫ್ರೋವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದವು. ಈಗ 50 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಬೇಕಾದುವು. ಎರಡೂ ಸೇರಿ 98 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಶೇಕಡ 5 ರೂಪಾಯಿಯ ಬಡ್ಡಿಯಂತೆ 10 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಂತುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು, 100 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಲೋನ್ ರೈಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರಿಗೆ ಪರಿಷ್ಕರಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮುರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಅವರು ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ರನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೊಸದು.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You said, Rs. 100 lakhs is nothing. When the Government which is generating four times the electricity can allow the Electricity Board to raise a loan of Rs. 100 lakhs, why should you not?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The Hon'ble Member must remember that we need not copy others always.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕಾಪಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಲ್ಲ.

After all, they wanted Rs. 100 lakhs and we have given them. If they want a bigger loan, they will approach the public and obtain the loan. There is no difficulty about that. We get 5 percent interest on that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಅಗಲೂ ನಾವೇ ಗ್ಯಾರಂಟಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—They could have got it at a lower rate of interest and the benefit would have gone to the consumer. They would have got the loan in the market at $\frac{1}{2}$ percent less and that benefit would have gone to the consumer.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಶ್ರೀ ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರು ಅಂಟಿಕರಪ್ಪನ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಅನ್ನು—ರೀ ಆರ್‌ಗನೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಆಗಿದೆ ಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ತೊಂದರೆ ಯಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ಡಿವಿಜನ್‌ರ ಕಮೀಷನರಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಕ್ಷಣ ಅಂಟಿಕರಪ್ಪನ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಜ್ಯೂರಿಸ್ ಡಿಕ್ಷನ್ ಹೋಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಸಣ್ಣ ಪುಟ್ಟ ಅಲಿಗೇಷನ್ಸ್ ಏನು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ ಅವುಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಂಟಿಕರಪ್ಪನ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಪಾಣ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನಿರ್ಧಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸಣ್ಣ ಪುಟ್ಟ ಕಂಪ್ಲೇಂಟ್ಸ್ ಏನಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಕೆಳಮಟ್ಟದಲ್ಲೇ ತೀರ್ಪಾಣವನ್ನಾಡಿ, ಗೆಜೆಟ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್ಸ್ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿಗೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಒಂದು. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಡಿವಿಜನ್‌ರ ಕಮೀಷನರನ್ನು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಕ್ಯುಟಿವ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್ ಆಗಿ ಅಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಿಂಪತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಊಹೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದಲ್ಲ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಂಪತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡು ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಾಹ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಮನೋಭಾವವನ್ನು ಬೆಳೆಸಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೂರನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಒಬ್ಬರಲ್ಲೇ ಕೇಂದ್ರೀಕೃತ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬ ಆಫೀಸರು ಒಂದು ಲೋಟ ಕಾಫಿ ಕುಡಿದ ಎಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಬಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಎನ್‌ಕ್ಯುಟಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಡವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ತೊಂದರೆ ಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡ.—ಇಂಡಿಪೆಂಡೆಂಟ್ ಬಾಡಿ ನೇಮಕವಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಅಷ್ಟೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಡಿವಿಜನ್ ಕಮೀಷನರ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸೂಪರ್ ಇನ್‌ಡೆಂಟ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮೀಷನರ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಪ್ರತಿ ಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಜುಡಿಸಿಯಲ್ ಬಾಡಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇಂಡಿ ಪೆಂಡೆಂಟ್ ಬಾಡಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಡೀಸೆಂಟ್ರಲೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಡಿವಿಜನ್‌ರ ಕಮೀಷನರ್ಸ್ ಅವರವರ ಜ್ಯೂರಿಸ್‌ಡಿಕ್ಷನ್ ಕೆಲಸ ಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅಂಟಿಕರಪ್ಪನ್ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಜ್ಯೂರಿಸ್ ಡಿಕ್ಷನ್ ಹೋಯಿತು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಆದಿ ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ವೇ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಸಣ್ಣ ಪುಟ್ಟ ಕಂಪ್ಲೇಂಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪದಲ್ಲೆಯೇ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೀಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿ ಈಗ ಕೊಂಡೆಕಾಲ ಮಾತ್ರ ಆಯಿತು. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನುಕೂಲ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಕಾಲ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡೋಣ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾಪಾ ಟು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Mr. speaker, I am indeed very grateful to Sri J. B. Mallaradhyia for pointing out some of the items where a little more description could have avoided any debate. I concede that in a few cases we could have been more descriptive. Nevertheless, the information that is furnished, gives in brief what is exactly needed to understand the scope of the demand for supplementary grant. I would try my best, next time to give you a better description of the items that will be included in the supplementary demand.

Another point which Sri J. B. Mallaradhyia raised was that there was ambiguity with regard to the term 'New Service'. I must make it very clear that the Public Accounts Committee very recently considered what exactly should be the criteria for New Service and after exhaustive consideration, a Government Order has been issued on the 17th February 1960 defining the term 'New Service'. I would like to read the Government Order itself:

“Government direct that the criteria for 'New Service, as per annexure should be followed in determining whether a particular item of expenditure, which is not contemplated in the Annual Financial Statement (Budget) is a New Service or not. In cases of doubt regarding the interpretation

of the term 'New Service', the opinion of the Finance Department is final.

The Secretaries to Government and the Heads of Departments should see that no additional expenditure on any item, coming under 'New Service' (not included in the Budget) should be incurred as a matter of course.

If during the course of the financial year a need arises to incur additional expenditure over and above the existing provisions under any items or expenditure on items which were not contemplated at the time of preparation of the Budget Estimates and which are proposed to be treated as 'New Service' the proposal should be made to the Finance Department through the Administrative Department..."

I would like to further explain the matter. If money is found by reappropriation then we bring it under New Service and ask for a token of grant of Rs. 100. But, if it could not be found out by reappropriation then we ask for the entire grant under 'New Service'. That is what is being followed after the Public Accounts Committee gave criteria for what should be the New Service.

Another point raised by Sri G. Venkatai Gowda was indeed perplexing to me. He said that if both the first and second instalments had been added to the original estimates, it would not have been a surplus budget but a very highly deficit budget. I pray for his kind attention to what I have got to say. Most of the demands now placed are taken into account in the revised estimate. Therefore revised figures and estimates include all those items of expenditure. If we see the revised estimates we will find either deficit or surplus after taking into account the New Services. Therefore there is nothing wrong in asking supplementary grants which is included in the revised estimate. The only thing is that we will not spend it unless the Legislature sanctions it. In

the case of reappropriation, in anticipation of sanction we spend and the bills will be paid only after sanction is obtained. Therefore our financial position is not altered simply because the supplementary grant is sanctioned.

My friend Sri V. Srinivasa Shetty said that three constables of Belgaum District were dismissed by the Superintendent of Police. These constables were dismissed long prior to integration. They filed a civil suit in the Court of the Civil Judge and the cases were decided in favour of the plaintiffs. Naturally they had to make payments. Therefore it is not a question of the Legal Department advising or not advising prior to the present Government. Therefore, we need not discuss this question further.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Was the suit filed after re-organisation?

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—The Superintendent of Police, Belgaum dismissed three constables and the case was pending in the civil court. It was decided that the money had to be provided in the budget.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The money was deposited on the 18th February 1960 and therefore we have to make a provision and bring it before the Legislature.

Another point raised by Sri J. B. Mallaradhya was with regard to payments under Provident Fund. The amounts were being provided under '43—Industries'. But, according to the ruling given by the Comptroller and Auditor General, it has to come under Demand No. 35. It is only a question of adjustment. The figures are furnished by the Accountant General and therefore we have included.

Another point raised was about the Famine Relief Fund. There is enough balance in the Famine Insurance Fund. The expenditure incurred under that Fund is transferred and when the expenditure is incurred, sanction of the Legislature has to be taken and therefore we have come with that demand.

Some of the Hon'ble members raised the question of pensions under the S. R. Act. This depends on the total pension payments in all the States and each State bears proportionate

(SRI T. MARIAPPA)

charges on a population basis. The figures are furnished by the Accountant General and therefore it is a question of book adjustments.

Sri J. B. Mallaradhya rightly urged that this House should have been taken into confidence so far as co-operative schemes were concerned. There is nothing new in these schemes. The House is aware of the Service Societies. There is some mistake in booking this expenditure. The head is "Construction of small sized godowns for large sized societies at Rs. 10,000 each." We are going to change it now. There is a printing mistake that these societies will be given Rs. 10,000. According to the all-India Plan, Rs. 150 will be given to every society but now according to the revised pattern, they want us to provide Rs. 300 per society.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.—150 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲ? 10,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Now we have provided Rs. 10,80,000 at the rate of additional Rs. 150 for 2725 Societies. Under the same head, we have made provision for share capital contribution and contribution for construction of certain godowns. The Government Order referring to these items is dated 15th January 1960. I will read out item by item. They are:—

- (1) Subsidy towards the establishment cost of service co-operatives;
- (2) construction of rural godowns;
- (3) Subsidy towards the establishment cost of branches of Central Banks;
- (4) subsidy towards the cost of Credit Unions;

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What are those Credit Unions?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—They are Unions which supervise every co-operative credit society. The other items are:—

- (5) Subsidy towards the establishment cost of supervising Unions;
- (6) Contribution to the share capital of primary Marketing societies.
- (7) Construction of godowns by primary marketing societies;

(8) Subsidy towards managerial cost to Primary Marketing Societies.

(9) Scheme for purchase of lorries or trucks by Primary Marketing Societies.

(10) Share capital contribution to Processing Societies.

(11) Subsidy towards managerial cost to Processing Societies.

(12) Co-operative Training and Education. In all, 12 schemes are approved on 15th January 1960, and that is in accordance with the All-India Plan. I will also read out the Government Order.

"In pursuance of the National Development Council Resolution on Co-operative Policy, the Government of India have indicated certain broad indications of policy to be followed by the Government. It was also pointed out that for implementing the new co-operative policy and for achieving the enhanced targets of Co-operative Development, it would be necessary to examine the existing programmes and revise them and that the State Government should take steps to prepare supplementary plans for the period July 1959 to March 1960. Supplementary plans were accordingly prepared and forwarded to the Government of India. The Government of India held discussions with the officers of the State Governments on these supplementary schemes of Co-operative Development, and agreed to a total outlay of Rs. 24.14 lakhs on account of them."

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.—ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೇಳಿದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಕೊಡು ತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಮತ್ತು ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಕೊಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರು ಇಲ್ಲ.

In respect of middle income group housing schemes, the Life Insurance Corporation gives money to the State Government at 5 per cent repayable in 20 years and the State gives it to the Housing Board on the same terms. Then with regard to the forest revenue, I got all the particulars.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.—34 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ 54 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ರಾಧ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In fact, I went into the whole question. The Demand for supply of sleepers and bamboos arose during the course of the year. Therefore for a major portion of the cost of transport and labour, they have spent Rs. 32 lakhs and they are likely to realise more than Rs. 54 lakhs. The modest estimate is Rs. 54 lakhs. Suppose you spend Rs. 32 lakhs and make Rs. 54 lakhs. It is a decent income.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—By spending Rs. 32 lakhs extra expenditure you say you are going to realise Rs. 54 lakhs more.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—We may expect more. That is a conservative estimate of the income.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is the doubt that arose in my mind. Then the note is correct. By spending an additional sum of Rs. 32 lakhs you are likely to realise an additional revenue of Rs. 54 lakhs.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—It is a very conservative estimate. We are likely to realise more. We do not want to give inflated figures. That is what they told me. I will verify and tell you.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If you realise additional revenue to the tune of Rs. 54 lakhs from the Forest Department by spending this sum of Rs. 32 lakhs we will agree.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—This additional sum is required to get an additional income of Rs. 54 lakhs.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಂಡಿಚರ್ ಫಾರಿಸ್ಟ್ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಿ ನಂಪಾದನೆಮಾಡಿ. ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನಂಬುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I will verify and tell the Hon'ble Member. Sri Nagan Gowda raised a few points with regard to the Sugarcane Cess Fund and with regard to field channels. It would have been much better if he had been here. I consulted my friend Sri Channabasappa. He said that it was not a mere channel to a Survey number. He says that they are going

to make a channel which carries one cusec of water which would irrigate 40 to 50 acres. Therefore, we have gone far ahead and we are going to make field channel which will take water even to the very doors of the raiyats. Sir, with regard to the sugarcane cess fund, we expect to get roughly 50 lakhs from all sugar factories. It depends upon the cane crushed and we are earmarking this sum of sugarcane cess fund for improving communications and for improving health conditions as in Mandya area. It is very wrong to say that money should be spent from general revenues for constructing cart-ways which are intended to take sugarcane to the factories. It is only after satisfying ourselves that the demand was genuine that we sanctioned the amount from the sugarcane Cess Fund. It cannot be given from the General funds. With these few words, I commend all these grants for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before I put the demands to the House, I want to make one point clear. The Hon'ble Member, Sri V. S. Patil wanted to know whether I suspended Rule 171 in view of the procedure that is adopted in the House. I will read for the benefit of the Hon'ble Member. Rule 171 which is as follows :—

“Supplementary, additional, excess and exceptional grants and votes of credit shall be regulated by the same procedure as is applicable in the case of demands for grants subject to such adaptations, whether by way of modifications, addition or omission as the Speaker may deem to be necessary or expedient.”

From the beginning, we have modified the procedure and this is the procedure which has been adopted from the beginning. So, I have not suspended any rule. But I have taken action under Rule 171. I will now put the Demands to the House. The question is :

“That a further sum not exceeding the amounts shown in the List

(MR. SPEAKER)

of Additional and Supplementary Grants for the year 1959-60 (Second Instalment) circulated to the members be granted to Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the period ending 31st March 1960 in respect of Demands No. 1, 5, 8, 10, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 44, 45, 48, 49, 51, 55, 57 and 58."

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by the Speaker, the motions for Additional and Supplementary Demands for Grants for the year 1959-60 (Second Instalment) which were adopted by the House, are reproduced below].

DEMAND No. 1.—TAXES ON INCOME
OTHER THAN CORPORATION TAX.

4. *Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 33 800 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of "Taxes on Income other than Corporation Tax".

DEMAND No. 5.—FOREST.

10. *Forest.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 32,32,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of "Forest".

DEMAND No. 8.—OTHER TAXES—
ADMINISTRATION.

13. *Other Taxes and Duties.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 24,69,00 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the

year ending the 31st day of March 1960, in respect of 'Other Taxes and Duties'."

DEMAND No. 10.—IRRIGATION.

18. *Irrigation Other Revenue Expenditure financed from Ordinary Revenues.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 9,41,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure financed from Ordinary Revenues'."

DEMAND No. 13.—GENERAL
ADMINISTRATION.

25. *General Administration (Except the sub-major heads B and C).*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 200 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of 'General Administration (Except the sub-major heads B and C)'."

DEMAND No. 17.—POLICE.

29. *Police.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 15,76,300 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of 'Police'."

DEMAND No. 19.—SCIENTIFIC
DEPARTMENTS.

36. *Scientific Departments.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 1,08,500 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of 'Scientific Departments'."

DEMAND No. 20.—EDUCATION.

37. *Education.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 500 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Education’.”

DEMAND No. 22.—PUBLIC HEALTH.

39. *Public Health.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 200 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Public Health’.”

DEMAND No. 24.—RURAL
DEVELOPMENT.40-A. *Rural Development.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 15,73,800 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Rural Development’.”

DEMAND No. 26.—CO-OPERATION.

42. *Co-operation.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 4,09,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Co-operation’.”

DEMAND No. 27.—INDUSTRIES INCLUDING
SERICULTURE AND CAPITAL
OUTLAY ON INDUSTRIAL DEVELOP-
MENT.43. *Industries and Supplies and 43-A
Capital Outlay on Industrial Develop-
ment.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 41,55,000 be granted to the Government to

defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Industries and Supplies and Capital Outlay on Industrial Development’.”

DEMAND No. 29.—CIVIL WORKS.

50. *Civil Works.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Civil Works’.”

DEMAND No. 32.—FAMINE.

54. *Famine.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 11,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Famine’.”

DEMAND No. 33.—TERRITORIAL AND
POLITICAL PENSIONS.54-A. *Territorial and Political
Pensions.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 2,15,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Territorial and Political Pensions’.”

DEMAND No. 35.—SUPERANNUATION
ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.55. *Superannuation Allowances and
Pensions.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 12,50,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Superannuation Allowances and Pensions’.”

DEMAND No. 36.—COMMUTATION OF PENSIONS.

55—A. *Commutation of Pensions financed from Ordinary Revenues.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 15,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Commutation of Pensions’.”

DEMAND No. 44.—ROAD AND WATER TRANSPORT SCHEMES.

XLVI-A. Receipts from Road and Water Transport Schemes—Working Expenses.

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 17,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Receipts from Road and Water Transport Schemes—Working expenses’.”

DEMAND No. 45.—COMPENSATION TO ZAMINDARS.

65. *Payment of Compensation to Landholders, on the Abolition of Zamindari System.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Payment of Compensation to landholders, on the Abolition of Zamindari System’.”

DEMAND No. 48.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

70. *Capital Outlay on Improvement of Public Health.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 5,40,000 be granted to the Government to defray the

charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Capital Outlay on Improvement of Public Health’.”

DEMAND No. 49.—INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.

72. *Capital Outlay on Industrial Development.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 17,50,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Capital outlay on Industrial Development’.

DEMAND No. 51.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON CIVIL WORKS.

81. *Capital Account of Civil Works Outside the Revenue Account.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 20,01,400 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Capital Account of Civil Works outside the Revenue Account’.”

DEMAND No. 55.—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.

83. *Payments of Commuted Value of Pensions.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 15,00,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of ‘Commuted Value of Pensions’.”

DEMAND No. 57.—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON SCHEMES OF GOVERNMENT TRADING.

85-A. *Capital Outlay on Schemes of Government Trading.*

“That a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 be granted to the Government to defray the Charges which will come in course

of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Schemes of Government Trading'."

DEMAND No. 58.—ADVANCES AND
LOANS.

*P. Loans and Advances by the State
Government.*

"That a further sum not exceeding Rs 90,00,200 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1960, in respect of 'Loans and Advances by the State Government'."

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to make one announcement. On the 11th we are meeting in the morning, because Saturday is a holiday. There is one more important announcement that I have to make. I have allowed one special resolution on the border question which will come before the House on the 11th morning.

The House now rises and will meet tomorrow at 1 P.M.

*The House adjourned at Five of the
Clock to meet again at One of the
Clock on Thursday, the 10th March 1960.*
